

COMMITTEE ON BILLS ON SECOND READING

May 24, 2004

6:00 PM

Chairman Lopez called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Lopez, Roy, Sysyn, DeVries, O'Neil

Messrs: Frank Thomas, Kevin Sheppard, Tim Clougherty, Tom Arnold

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Ordinance:

“Amending Sections 33.024, 33.025 & 33.026 (Youth Services Counselors I & II to Youth Services Counselor) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester.”

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to recommend that the Ordinance ought to pass.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Ordinance:

“Amending Section 70.57(A) Parking Rates of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by deleting references to the Canal Street Garage.”

On motion of Alderman Sysyn, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to recommend that the Ordinance ought to pass.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Ordinance:

“Amending Sections 32.19 (Building Maintenance to Facilities Division) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester.”

Alderman DeVries moved to recommend that the Ordinance ought to pass.
Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Lopez stated I have a question for Frank Thomas. In looking at this I note that there is a calculation and once we get into the Finance Committee I'm sure it is going to come up. What is the amount of money that is going to be on the operating side of the City budget if this goes through?

Frank Thomas, Director of Public Works, answered there's going to be \$75,154 that's added to the Building Maintenance budget. 85 percent of that will be recovered revenues through anticipated charges to projects that are being worked on. That amount is already funded in the building maintenance budget under special projects.

Chairman Lopez asked so you're anticipating on the bonds that we do projects on, you're going to take a percentage of that?

Mr. Thomas answered no. We will charge the actual hours that the facility engineer works on those particular projects.

Chairman Lopez asked is the intent of the facility engineer...what's the intent of the facility engineer versus a construction engineer?

Mr. Thomas answered first of all most City projects you still utilize outside private sector services to do designs, put together the bidding documents, potentially even do inspection services. This facility engineer would be the person that manages the project on behalf of the City making the decisions, approving the designs, and the work that is going on. So that would be the prime function of that job. If we don't add to the facility staff, what will happen is that you're going to have to hire more outside services to make up that shortfall. So instead of paying a person at a City wage you'll now be paying additional dollars at a rate of some where between \$65.00 to \$125.00. Now based on the Finance Committee meeting, I did put a summary of these facts together which I'll be glad to give out tonight. The second part of the question that you asked at the Finance Committee was do we have a workload to satisfy ourselves that this position will stay gainfully employed. We tried to project out over the next few years the type of work that we envision will be coming down in the City. But keep in mind this, there's always going to be facility work that's being done and there's always going to be a relationship with the private sector on this facility work. If sometime in the future, for whatever reason, the amount of facility work drops down in the City, this City employee will still be gainfully employed because what we will do is we will reduce if necessary the outside professional services down to zero in order to utilize these employees. So I feel very, very confident that in the short term it is desperately

needed, in the long term even if there is a downturn in the amount of facility work that's being done, we're still going to be utilizing these employees to do design instead of having the private sector do the work.

Alderman DeVries stated if I just heard you correctly, there is \$63,000 of the \$75,000 that is showing an anticipated offset by matching revenues coming in from the bonding.

Mr. Thomas replied that's correct. Based on past history we anticipate approximately 85 percent of that time should be able to be charged off to the actual projects.

Alderman DeVries asked leaving \$12,000 approximately?

Mr. Thomas replied as a net City cost, however, keep in mind that the total \$75,000 is being funded in special projects with the offsetting revenue identified.

Alderman DeVries asked if we were not to pass this Ordinance for these positions, we would have to reduce the revenue in the Building Maintenance department as well?

Mr. Thomas answered you'd have to reduce the revenue because it is in there. But again, as I try to point out it's going to cost more ultimately because you have the projects, you're going to have to make up that expertise, you're going to have to do that on the private sector side in that higher salary range.

Alderman DeVries stated certainly and the additional charges because it does cost more if you have pay for the outside consultants if you outsource it, that's charged off within the bonding.

Mr. Thomas replied that's correct.

Alderman DeVries continued so the increase goes up of the amount that it takes to do each of these projects.

Mr. Thomas replied that is correct.

Alderman DeVries stated an additional question if I could. You gave us the spreadsheet that indicates the future potential workload for the individuals. Can you tell me if you've taken a look at the potential future offset associated with those projects and bondings? Are you saying that you see that this position would likely be offset through 2008?

Mr. Thomas answered based on what we see on the sheets. But again, I'm no magician. I don't know what is going to happen two years out. We know that there's a problem at the elementary school level. We feel that there is going to be something happening in that area over the next few years. Other projects may come up. As you know there's a major investment being made in the Library this year with air conditioning and other HVAC. Quite frankly, that wasn't envisioned two years ago, so I see that the City is going to continue to be making investments in their facilities. But again, the key is, even if we're down to only one or two projects, if they are one or two large projects and you put this individual not doing just the construction administrative but actual hands on design, the person is going to earn his keep.

Alderman DeVries stated certainly I understand that and I look to some of the projects that we have undertaken in the past without this particular oversight in place, and I think we have learned from those lessons that we have spent some money unnecessarily by projects going too far along before it is discovered that they are over budget or other problems exist. Is it your intention that by having all of the City projects basically under the oversight of this department, that we will prevent some of those scenarios and there are additional unseen savings?

Mr. Thomas responded yes. Again, I feel that that is a very true point. Again, when we go through some these exercises that a project may be funded directly to a department to administer and they have X amount of dollars, they are going to make sure they're spending X amount of dollars on the project. Where if you have an independent facility division that doesn't have any special interest on any one building, I think you're going to get your monies worth. Second of all, right now the way it's being done it is very fractured. Projects are being done all over the City. There isn't that attention being paid to standardization of equipment. Standardizing equipment you're going to be able to potentially stock parts, you're going to be able to get vendors that know what you have and ultimately there's going to be a cheaper price. In addition, preventive maintenance is a key now. If you have a standardized set of equipment it's much easier to perform preventive maintenance. So I think over the long term there's going to be a definite savings. In addition, operational manuals procedures and this and that can be developed now, at least in the future, by having one set of eyes overseeing all of these projects.

Chairman Lopez asked Frank, in reading the class specifications, do you anticipate that you would be making some type of policy for all of the departments that have buildings as to what the sort of steps would be and if you had a facility engineer?

Mr. Thomas answered well I think what we would try to do is coordinate all projects with the departments so that we're not just out going ahead by ourselves. If it's a fire station project, obviously we'll have fire station personnel. Again, I don't think we're going to put out memos at least at this time saying to a department if you've got ten bucks you can't paint the wall without checking with us. I don't think that that's our intent at this point.

Chairman Lopez stated and understanding you charging the bond, there's been some conversation that I've had with some other people that are saying that that's going to increase the bonding.

Mr. Thomas replied that is totally false. I heard that rumor and that is not the case. Again, let me try to put it this way. If you have one person that's trying to do all of the facility work in the City, that one person can not handle it, so you have to depend more on the private sector to make up for what you're not able to do. Theoretically you could have one person that sits in an office behind a desk, contracting out high paid consultants, make all of your decisions, who would basically run the whole show, and you sit at your desk and maybe once a week this consultant comes in and says okay we're building a fire station, this is what it looks like. Does it look all right to you and you nod your head and off you go. You're turning over 90 percent of the responsibility to manage that project off to that private sector and then you're paying them \$100 per hour for instance. So it's actually going to cost you more money on the projects than having enough staff on board that you're paying a lot less than the private sector. What you want is a balance. You want a balance between and the private sector. You don't want to get to top heavy with staff because that's not efficient. But you want to have that right balance so that you have enough staff, you have enough of the private sector, but not too much. The more you can do with City staff, the less it's going to cost you ultimately to have the job. I hear statements that you're going to have to fund more on the bond because of this reorganization. I'll stand up to anybody and debate that point with them, because if you have one person and you have to supplement that one person with more outside work, where are you going to pay that consultant or that architect? You're going to pay it out of the bond, so more money is going to be charged to that bond the more you use the outside professional services.

Chairman Lopez stated let's go back just a couple of things. When we bond a project we have the architect, construction engineer, and a sole analysis. You're not anticipating, and then for an example the consultant, let's take Mike Costana. Are you anticipating that you won't need a Mike consultant any more?

Mr. Thomas answered no I don't say that. Right now the way it works is you have a City staff person working with a consultant like a Mike Costana or CLD to provide construction administration and inspection services for the project. Right now that staff person is doing a lot of the coordination, a lot of the oversight, a lot of the decision process where the consultant is an extension of that staff person. However, that staff person is still devoting a percent of his time to that project. What we're saying is we don't have the staff personnel on board that can spend that time, because we have one facility engineer that's spread out all over the place on all of these different projects. By bringing on two, you're going to be able to have that interrelation where you have City staff overseeing what the private sector does. Now if you don't bring on that City staff, instead of having the City staff overseeing that private consultant or architect, now you're bringing on a much higher level construction manager like a DMJM like we have on the school facilities project, that we're paying well over \$100 an hour to assume more of the role of the staff person.

Chairman Lopez stated my question is this, this position will not take the place of signing off on any construction then?

Mr. Thomas answered no it will not at the amount of work that's out there right now. If sometime in the future, the level of facility projects drop down, this facility engineer that we're bringing on board may wind up doing the actual design, may have more dealings on the field meeting type of deal than we're having right now. Right now we had the Constana's out there working for us, if things get slow this position may do more of those responsibilities, but right now no.

Chairman Lopez asked you don't want to see us in a position that where City employees are signing off anything or doing architect work that is liable to us as a City versus having a consultant or architect or construction person?

Mr. Thomas replied well that's true, but keep in mind this, I'm a profession engineer, Kevin is a professional engineer. I've done many designs that I've put my stamp on, so I've committed the City. I have engineers that are working for me; Dennis Ansel and Bruce Thomas. They are stamping plans on a daily basis. So it can be done, but again, it is not our intent to eliminate the sector because two people aren't going to be able to do that.

Alderman Roy stated Frank a few questions for you. First off, I love the division and not department. Is this in your eyes ever destined to become it's own stand alone or is this something that will always be part of the Public Works or Highway Department?

Mr. Thomas stated that's a consolidation that's been a success. You want to go the opposite way, I can't recommend it, no.

Alderman Roy stated I just wanted to hear that from you and get that in the minutes. I always look at things as planning for the future, and while I think you've got a top notch staff now, is this something that we'll be able to go out and hire in the private sector and draw in people in the future, whether it be 5, 10, 15 years down the road as people move through our City's employment?

Mr. Thomas answered I would like to think that we'll be able to find a qualified individual to fill this position. And again, I think we have the proper staffing to train an individual to really perform the way that we want between myself, Kevin and Tim Clougherty.

Alderman Roy stated I never have any complaints with your department and your current staff. I just want to make sure that we're not setting the bar too high for the future.

Mr. Thomas stated but again, there's been these misunderstandings that have taken place in the past. By bringing on one facility engineer or two facility engineers, you're not eliminating the need for the outside private sector. You're always going to need that outside private sector. But again, the more that you can do in house, the better off you are. And quite frankly, right now we have the quantity of work that we can't do it all in house.

Alderman Roy stated on a more technical note, under the required special qualifications for the superintendent and clerk of the works positions, there's an on call status and a valid New Hampshire driver's license. On the driver's license would it be more appropriate to possibly have them the ability to step into a larger vehicle if need be? Is that something that could be thought about?

Mr. Thomas answered we can consider it quite frankly on a voluntary basis I have asked all my supervisory staff to hold commercial driver's licenses. I have one, Kevin has one, because we have had problems with labor in the past and it's proved very beneficial that supervisors have commercial licenses. So typically I do ask all of my management and professional staff to obtain commercial driver's license on their own.

Alderman Roy stated and just the last thing on the qualifications. On the facilities superintendent it has an on call status, but not on the chief facilities manager. Is that just an oversight or is that covered that they know they'll be on call as you gentlemen are on a 24-hour basis.

Mr. Thomas replied any of our management staff is on an on call basis. The wording could be added in there, but again, if there's a problem, our supervisory staff is expected to be on call.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just for some reason dug out of my CIP book the budget for the South Main Street Fire Station actually led us to increasing that amount to \$1.6 million, and I note in here architect and engineering fees 8.8 percent. It's probably a little bit high but my guess is it's because the architect will be required to prepare all of the construction and bidding documents, etc. etc., and there's actually a budget number. Now this had nothing to do with what we're talking about tonight, there's actually a budget number in there of \$10,000 for clerk of the works. So we were going to pay the architect \$10,000 to have a clerk of the works.

Mr. Thomas stated keep in mind, you're not approving a clerk of the works right now.

Alderman O'Neil stated but I'm just saying. To answer the question that we have been paying for those things, either the architects or the engineers and I heard that same rumor that we were going to increase the bond amount. If anything, we may end up saving in the long run bond amounts because of some control in house. I think this is a step in the right direction.

Chairman Lopez stated it remains to be seen as the projects go forward as to what the increase is going to be. We can debate certain projects as to how much percentage is going to be charged to both of these positions, and whether or not this project is going to be charged. You have five projects, A project might not be charged because there's not enough money in there and you might go to B project in order to get all of the funds out of B project. If you want an example, I'll give you an example. There's no money in the Derryfield project for this type arrangement. So somebody is going to have to take care of that. When the next project comes along if this passes through the full Board and you're going to have to get money from some place in order to work on that and charge in between.

Mr. Thomas stated I think the point that we're trying to make here is I don't want you to think that net is only going to be 15 percent every year. Some years the net cost may be after revenues, might be 20 percent. Some years it may be 10 percent. Yes, if we bring on this facility engineer and Derryfield is still going and for whatever reason we want this new position involved in it, yes you're right, there is no money on Derryfield. However, I would like to think also that if we had this facility engineer on that could have spend a little bit more time on the Derryfield project, that we wouldn't be in such a hole right now.

Alderman DeVries stated over the course of the last two years, were yourself and Kevin ever very involved with the senior center and Rines Center projects?

Mr. Thomas answered yes and quite frankly, we shouldn't be.

Alderman DeVries interjected I couldn't agree with you more. You really should not be.

Mr. Thomas interjected you've heard me state that I shouldn't be spending the amount of time on the baseball stadium project that I have. Kevin Sheppard is spending a lot of time on...he did spend a lot of time on the Rines Center, he's spending a lot of time right now on Memorial field, and I think it's important, these projects are important, but yet my job is to oversee the entire operation of the department, look at policy decisions, try to chart a course for the future and not be, quite frankly, a project manager.

Alderman DeVries asked and you feel that by us creating this will help that scenario?

Mr. Thomas answered it will help.

Alderman DeVries interjected because we have some solid waste issues in the City that we need your leadership and guidance and full attention on so that we can come up with some policies and chart a course for that future.

Chairman Lopez stated we should send this to the Finance Committee because it's in the budget process and we should make sure that the money is okayed by the Finance Committee during the budget process.

Mr. Thomas stated we could submit it to the Finance Committee but right now it is funded in the budget for building maintenance.

Chairman Lopez stated it's funded in the operating budget for 2005 right now. We haven't approved that yet. That's why I on instructions from the Clerk that we should put it to the Finance Committee.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked are you sending it to the Finance Committee just to review as far as the budgetary side of it? I think when I discussed that with you earlier that certainly if want to talk the budget out, that would be the appropriate place to do that. This committee still has the technical review authority, so if you're going to do that, you should do it either deferring your technical review to Finance as well, so that that report can come out together or send it out with no recommendation determining that.

Alderman O'Neil asked couldn't we send the technical part directly to the full Board and just the budgetary part to be reviewed by Finance?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied the other side of it could be that in terms of the technical review it's recommended that it ought to pass, but in terms of the budget subject to budgetary review.

Alderman O'Neil stated I didn't make the original motion but I think that may be the best way to go.

Chairman Lopez asked is that okay with the maker, Alderman DeVries?

Alderman DeVries answered yes.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted that the Ordinance ought to pass subject to budgetary review by the Finance Committee.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Report of the Committee on Administration/Information Systems recommending that the Board approve an ordinance establishing a 100-foot distance from the door of a polling location to the beginning of the 10-foot corridor allowed by statute for people holding signs at the polling places.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to recess the meeting to meet with legal counsel.

Chairman Lopez called the meeting back to order.

On motion of Alderman Sysyn, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to receive and file the report.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Report of the Committee on Administration/Information Systems recommending that the Board of Aldermen set the Mayor's base salary at \$85,000.00 per year effective January 2006 and that each year that a Mayor provides continuous service the salary for such position shall be increased in accordance with the Consumer Price Index (CPI). At any time a person initiates a term of office, or is appointed to complete an unexpired term of

office, for the position of Mayor the salary shall initiate at the base salary of \$85,000.00. The Committee further recommends that such provisions of salary for the Mayor be forwarded to the voters as a non-binding referendum question.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm not on the Committee on Administration. What happens if...I think that's a step in the right direction, but what happens...is there any provision to allow a review 10 years from now or 20 years from now, moving back to that base position will get us in a bind. Is that how I'm reading it? You have over the next 20 years you could have theoretically 10 Mayors. Every new term it would drop back to \$85,000?

Chairman Lopez answered that's correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked won't 10 years from now or 15 years from now or 20 years, won't... you put the adjustment for continuous service Mayor with a Consumer Price Index, but shouldn't there be an adjustment to the base salary?

Chairman Lopez replied I think we have to remember that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen can raise the salary of any Mayor going for the voters to do a non-binding question. The Board has that authority. Your question down the road, if the Board of Mayor and Aldermen are seeing that there was something wrong with that, they could change it just by a vote of the Board for the incoming Mayor.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected Mr. Chairman, before you continue on down the line, I think you really want to talk to your Solicitor because he did have some information regarding what's before you to begin with, which is going affect the other questions coming up.

Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, stated I'd point out that the Manchester City Charter in pertinent provides that the Mayor's salary should not be increased from the time of any election until the close of the term for the Mayor then elected. So as the proposal is to do on a yearly basis, I think that violates the City Charter, because you'd be increasing his salary while he is in office. What you could do, I think, is for instance, increase it by the CPI in the last year of his term and then have it take effect after he is reelected.

Alderman O'Neil asked where was the City Solicitor when all of this was going through?

Chairman Lopez answered I don't know, but the question I have. Let's go back to this. We went through this procedure at the full Board. We can raise the Mayor's salary, from what I understand, if the Board of Mayor and Aldermen wanted to

raise the salary we could do it and it would be effective in 2006. So you agree with that?

Solicitor Arnold replied yes, that would be the next term.

Chairman Lopez stated this says \$85,000 per year effective 2006. So this is the next term of the new Mayor.

Solicitor Arnold replied right.

Chairman Lopez asked okay, so what part did I miss that you're saying?

Solicitor Arnold answered in this proposal you have that \$85,000 adjusted by the Consumer Price Index, the CPI, yearly.

Chairman Lopez stated okay, so you're saying that we have to go by the term?

Solicitor Arnold answered that's correct. You can use the CPI, but you've got to do it by the term.

Chairman Lopez asked I see what you're saying now.

Alderman O'Neil stated Mr. Chairman, I don't have a problem with that. My problem is where was the City Solicitor's office when this was working its way through the Administration Committee?

Chairman Lopez stated I'll let the City Attorney speak.

Solicitor Arnold stated I can speak to that. I was at the original meeting where this concept was raised. After it was referred to this committee, I went back at that point and took a look at the Charter and that's when I discovered this inconsistency and that's why I raise it now since it was being raised here.

Alderman O'Neil stated but Tom you should have written us a note or something before we have the meeting tonight. That's my point. I don't want to spend time on it but if you have an opinion, you've got to let us know what that opinion is. Not the night of the meeting.

Chairman Lopez asked do you have something written out that is legal?

Solicitor Arnold replied not at this point.

Chairman Lopez asked Carol, do you have anything that we have to change here? What do we want to do here?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered I guess it was referred to this committee. We don't have any...technically I don't have a question to put as a non-bonding question in the first place. So I would need to get that information from the Solicitor's office. I think you need to make the change that he talks about rather than saying per year, it's going to have to be tied to the term. So I think what you probably want to do is make sure you have in order whatever you wanted included and then have the Solicitor do up the language accordingly and then we could submit that to the full Board.

Alderman O'Neil asked do we want to put this on the table then? Is that what's suggested?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered you can put it on the table or you can give directions to him exactly what you want in there and refer that directly out to the Board, but we need to be very clear if we do that as to what exactly it is you want.

Chairman Lopez stated I think there's plenty of time of us to get it on the ballot.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected before you table it, if you're going to have him bring back some language, you might want to make sure he has all of the information that you want him to have in there.

Chairman Lopez stated so the first part, effective 2006, you have no problem with Tom?

Solicitor Arnold answered no.

Chairman Lopez stated the only problem you have is the increase in the Consumer Price Index. What would you suggest that that be? Something like 2006 or the correct terminology?

Solicitor Arnold answered what I would probably suggest for terminology is that the Mayor's salary be increased in the last year of his term by the Consumer Price Index to take effect after he is reelected and takes office again.

Chairman Lopez asked does anybody have a problem with that?

Alderman DeVries stated it's not that I have a problem with that, but you're saying that it will be written into the Ordinance that there is always an assumption that an individual would be reelected, so the language would say that if he is reelected, the CPI will go into effect upon initiation of the new term?

Chairman Lopez answered that's correct. Is that what you're saying Tom?

Solicitor Arnold answered yes, otherwise it goes back to the \$85,000 in line with the Committee on Administration's wishes.

Alderman DeVries asked and to address an escalator, I guess we would have to write that in in the same sort of future tense that upon initiating a new term, and maybe it should be every five years, some sort of an escalator clause so that the amount that we are proposing stays current with the economy.

Chairman Lopez stated I guess it is something that we could recommend to the full Board. I think what this is is the technical review to make sure that we're putting the right question on the ballot.

Alderman Roy stated as much as we'd like to talk about an escalator, I'd prefer to talk about a cap. At CPI, whether it's per term or per year, we could be looking at someone making over \$100,000 - \$110,000 campaigning against a new Mayor or the potential of a new Mayor, that offers to take the \$85,000 and as much as this can be redone every couple of years by a vote of this Board, I don't like the introduction of the CPI. I don't like the escalator, I don't like the fact that it's automatic, we don't do it for our employees, so I don't think it would be fair to do it for our Mayor. As we sit on this Board, many times the issue of Alderman pay has come up and I believe the Mayor is underpaid. Not speaking of this particular gentleman, but I believe the Mayor's of this City deserve to be compensated, but I do not believe a CPI should be included anywhere in this language.

Chairman Lopez stated that's what the problem is going to be once it goes out for referendum question. That's why the Charter stipulates the Board of Mayor and Aldermen can make a decision, so that's a whole new ballgame. The Board has decided to go out for referendum, I think that we have to deal with as a committee as to the right legal language that we want in there. So if we want something else in there that is technical, let's say what we want, take a vote on it, tell Tom to draft it and bring it back.

Alderman DeVries stated I am comfortable tabling this tonight and it has nothing to do with the language or the proposal before us, but has everything to do with the uncertainty of our budget and I just feel that if the State Education Funding is shortfall to the City of Manchester this year by \$4 million, it doesn't matter what

language we send out to the voters, it's doomed. And I would like to have that opportunity to consider where we stand with our funding from the State before we send this forward to the public for their vote. So I would definitely be in favor of tabling this. I would like to further the discussion when we come back for whether there should be the CPI or have the correct language if we do wish to have the CPI. But I think we can table it and have that discussion another day.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to table this item.

Chairman Lopez stated I just want to make a comment to make sure that everybody understands on the committee that the next time we talk about it, we have time so that the City Attorney, whatever we decide, can go back and write it up afterwards so that will be two meetings to make sure that everybody understand that.

TABLED ITEMS

8. Ordinance:

“Amending the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by creating a new section within Chapter 111: Amusements establishing regulations for noise activities conducted in outdoor concert venues throughout the city and inserting new penalties in Section 111.99: Penalty to enforce these regulations.”

(Tabled 11/06/2002)

The item remained on the table.

9. Ordinance:

“Amending the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester by changing the zoning district of property currently zoned IND (General Industrial) to R-SM (Residential Suburban Multifamily) by extending the R-SM zone district on a portion of property identified as TM478, Lot 8, located on Candia Road.”

(Tabled 10/14/2003)

The item remained on the table.

There being no further business to come before the committee, on motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee